

**REMARKS**

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

**I. Disposition of Claims**

Claim 1 is pending in this application.

**II. Amendments to the Specification**

The Summary of Invention has been amended in this reply to correspond with the language in amended claim 1. The amendments do not constitute new matter. Support for the amendments may be found in Figure 1, among other places.

**III. Objections**

The abstract was objected for language and format. A replacement abstract is included in this reply. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 was objected to for informalities. Specifically, the Examiner indicated that several terms lacked antecedent basis. Claim 1 has been amended to correct each of the occurrences noted by the Examiner. None of the amendments to claim 1 were made in view of prior art, and none of the changes constitute new matter. Withdrawal of the objections to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

**IV. Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C § 112**

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as indefinite. Claim 1 has been amended in this reply to clarify the present invention. As amended, claim 1 now recites that the resilience piece comprises “a first bend section comprising a proximal end portion for joining the housing and the resilience piece.” Applicant believes that amended claim 1 more accurately describes the embodiment in Figure 1, as well as the discussion on page 13, lines 2-25 of the specification.

The amendment made to claim 1 simply clarifies the present invention, and was not made in view of any prior art. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

#### **V. Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C § 102**

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,364,709 (Jones). Claim 1 has been amended in this reply to clarify the present invention, but has not substantively changed in scope in view of Jones. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The transceiver cage disclosed by Jones is discussed as prior art in the specification (Specification, Figures 12 and 13, page 1, line 25- page 3, line 24). Specifically, the resilience pieces 58a, 58b disclosed by Jones may be plastically deformed during repetitions of inserting and removing a transceiver module (Specification, page 3, line 16). The resilience pieces 58a, 58b disclosed by Jones consist of a first bend section 60 and a second bend section 61, with a substantially planar portion 62 joining the bend sections 60 and 61. The damage typically occurs at the first bend section 60 on the resilience pieces 58a, 58b. As damage occurs to the resilience pieces 58a, 58b, the ejection function of the resilience piece is diminished.

In contrast to Jones, claim 1 recites that the resilience piece comprises “a first bend section comprising a proximal end for joining the housing and the resilience piece, a second bend section comprising a protruding end, and at least one intermediate bend section provided between the first bend section and the second bend section.” Jones neither shows nor suggests that the portion of the resilience pieces between the first and second bend sections should be bent rather than planar. The Applicant has found that the inclusion of an intermediate bend section on the resilience pieces advantageously distributes the stress that occurs during the insertion and removal of a transceiver module (Specification, page 4, line 24- page 5, line 6). As a result of the improved stress distribution, the resilience pieces exhibit increased durability and resistance

to plastic deformation. Jones is silent on alternative shapes for the resilience pieces for the purpose of improving durability.


In view of the above, Jones fails to show or suggest the present invention as recited in claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Jones. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

## VI. Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 07700/040001).

Dated: December 8, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By  #451077  
Jonathan P. Osha  
Registration No.: 33,986  
(713) 228-8600  
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant

Attachments



Application No. (if known): 10/646,194

Attorney Docket No.: 07700/040001

## Certificate of Express Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.10

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as Express Mail, Airbill No. **EV53568159405** in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on December 6, 2004  
Date

Signature

Toni A. Hill

Typed or printed name of person signing Certificate

Registration Number, if applicable

713-228-8600  
Telephone Number

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of mailing, or this certificate must identify each submitted paper.